

100

not repaired. He recollected that some persons who were employed in the business had petitioned and their case was decided in favor of the tanners, but he did not give way, but obliged them to go beyond the town. He forgot the names of the persons, but he was probably the same persons to whom the law, however, was having removed to Redfern. The town did not stand by them, when this Act was passed in 1818. Now, however, it has been stated that no English Act contained this provision for tanners and curriers, they would find that several sections of the Act were taken from the English Act.

Mr. PARKES: The hon. member was quite right with the section of tanner and curriers. They would find all the other tanners included in the English law, but not tanners and curriers.

Mr. PLUNKETT continued: That might be so. Then he

These persons considered they were unjustly so, because they had kept in their own interest, and after the bill was introduced, they had not been in the committee to have the bill amended in regard to soap-boilers, and all other persons affected, so that the bill went out on the same footing as the tanners and curriers, and would be accepted from the operation of the law also. It would not be fair to give justice if they made a bill of the one and finish of the other. He should oppose the bill.

Mr. LUCAS said: "The bill to be referred to a select committee, and that the words 'to tanners and' be struck out. I thought it would be a very bad precedent to exempt the curriers from the operation of the existing law, and that to do so would do a very great act of injustice to soap-boilers and others, who are not exempted."

of the Act referred to, had moved their place of business out of the city. He considered the trade of a tanner as one which could be done as well elsewhere as in the city. FOSTER said that he was in favor of the hon. member who had been elected upon the others expiring to-day.

It was then moved by the hon. member (Mr. FOSTER) that the House do send a select committee to inquire into the matter of the tanners' petition, and that the committee be in force for several years, but that the hon. member who moved the motion should be authorized to report as soon as there should be sufficient grounds for them to do so. He thought the only course for the hon. member to follow would be to refer the matter to a select committee. If the select committee in the case should come to the opinion that the provision of the law was wrong, it would then be for the House to alter it as now proposed. Sufficient information had not been laid before the House to justify it in assenting to the amendment in the law. The trades of tanners and saddlers were distinct and different.

The city. Whether the public health was not the best thing he could do for the city, was another matter; the fact could not be denied that they were off base. He should suggest that the bill be referred to a select committee. He had intended, before the board met, to bring his son's membership's speech to vote against the bill, but, after what he had heard, he decided to abstain from voting.

PARKES said, if he might be permitted at that stage of proceedings, he would beg leave to state to the House that he noted no objection to the bill being referred to a select committee. If any member made such a motion he was prepared to support it.

MARTIN said that the hon. member had relieved him difficulty, inasmuch as he thought that they should not

lived in the neighbourhood where there were no houses, and he had heard them not objected to. His (Mr. M^r. Arthur's) enquiries met with a different result. He had heard them generally praised of.

Mr. BLACK'S object in rising was to state a few of his reasons for opposing the bill. Seeing that we had in Sydney thousands of men in great abundance we ought to take care and not run any risk of promoting the increase of anything so objectionable. He would not, he must admit, to understand, since soap & silders were sold in the city, who were to be exempted. Great consideration had been given to with regard to the street-buses, and ad object of which had been their entire removal from the city; and we should, he thought, be acting with

deficiency if soap-sellers were by law excluded and lantern not used. In a sanitary point of view the carrying on of such a trade would be held to be injurious to the community. But the usual better proof were adduced to the contrary. In the first place the business had been strenuously objected to—for instance the municipality of Redfern—and he put it to the House whether it considered to be injurious, even there, outside Sydney, to the more important and more numerous city itself. Besides he did not help thinking that those persons who were carrying on the trade with the previous Act, had removed their businesses, would be grievously, if others who were carrying on prescribed trades were allowed to follow: then notwithstanding the proclamation of the Act. He had heard such persons state that if such an power, the law would be a great deal more useful, they had a equitable claim for compensation. He thought that

hardly to be expected that without further enquiry the
would support this bill. Under the information obtained
select committee it was possible something might be done to
these persons with regard to their business, but it was
and that no report could be made of the business of a saloon
could be carried on without great offence, and without
serious danger to the public health. (Hear, hear.)

MR. BROUGHTON said that the hon. member had stated that
had been found with open houses in establishments. Perhaps
it would be impossible to prove they had been destroyed
in, but they had been proved nuisances. He
mentioned that several informations had been filed against
dishmen in Elizabeth street for carrying on the business.
The police had been instructed by Mr. Begg, by Mr. Chambers,
and Mr. Macfarlane, to take action against the saloon

[illegible]

ROBERTS believed that when the Act was passed, it must be considered that these trades were offensive in their nature and that it was a serious and a public nuisance. It is entirely comprehensive, for their was an Act passed to amend the first Act in 1850, the provisions of which it was to be modified and repealed also. Having considerable experience in prosecutions under this Act, he thought it was monstrous to expect that the different trades enacted should not be carried out. Many attempts had been made by individuals to earn an honest livelihood, but prosecutions were instituted, they were fined and the nuisances were

These persons who had not been prosecuted ought to be, it was illegal to carry on the business of a lender and carrier of money, and it was at that time that the bill was introduced upon legislation. It was not to be supposed that ten years ago there was any hasty legislation, because they had the Act of 1849 amended by the Act of 1850. It would be a monstrous injustice to respect the supposed rights of a few individuals, and to disregard the rights of the great body of the community considered to be offensive. He would support the measure for referring the matter to a select committee, and he thought it would be dangerous to adopt any other course.

BYRNES proposed that the bill be referred to a select committee, consisting of Messrs. J. H. Broughton, Sir D. Hall, Mr. Denham, Jenkins, Lewis, Nott, Parkes, and Parnell. GORDON said it appeared to him that the introduction of

It was altogether out of place. That portion of the bill it was sought to repeal was assented to on the 12th October, and the parties now carrying on the trades enumerated in the bill were not liable to be affected by it. It was the object of the bill unless it was to give special advantage to tanners and curriers. He intended to vote against the reading of the bill, and also against its being referred to a committee.

Mr. CAKEBART thought there was an additional reason why the bill should be thrown out. If it were sent to a select committee and afterwards passed, they might expropriate claims for compensation to be sent in of no ordinary amount.

Mr. CAKEBART hoped the bill would be referred to a select committee. He found that the most important members of the original committee were absent. If a select committee were named, and most of the members were present, and the subject of the bill was

important provisions by the casting vote of the chairman. PLUNKETT said, whatever were the divisions on the first he found the same clauses enacted in an amended Act, and instead of giving them less years, as far as the 1900 Act was concerned, he would give them more. He thought that year had passed on any of the trades enumerated had rendered themselves to penalties not exceeding £50. Compensation now was out of the question. He should vote, therefore, for rejecting the bill for consideration to a select committee. MR. KILGIB said that he was not sure that any suggestions had place under this act, it was only reasonable to suppose the occupation had not been found injurious to health, and this was the reason why the law had become dead letter. PLUNKETT: No, the public have not done their duty.

had been at all disagreeable, the parties in the neighbourhood soon have taken the matter into their own hands and have them removed; but instead of that these very parties had asked the House to allow the settlements to remain. I am, on looking over the evidence appended to the report, very much of the same way in it against the tannery curriers, and it appeared that these words had been slipped in during the passage of the bill by committee unknown to the parties most interested. He said he was not at all surprised that a set of curriers, who, unless indeed, they were a set of curriers, would be afraid of the tannery curriers, and he had taken great pains to enquire into this subject, and he found that instead of being an unhealthy occupation, it was one that was remarkably conducive to health—the anti-

LANG would vote for amending the bill to a select committee, partly because it was one that affected the interests of numerous classes of citizens, and partly because there was not sufficient evidence before the House as to the merits of such branches of business as ought to be taken up. If he had remained so long unacted on, showed that there must have been something radically wrong in it, and that therefore it was timely permitted to become obsolete.

LODER would vote against the reading of the bill, and would not object to sending the bill to a select committee. This course becoming a nuisance, that was in a great measure owing to whether the premises on which it was con-

There were kept in a cleanly safe or not. And the same thing was said of the cleanliness of the tannery. But the question was of that of burping, for he had been heard to say that if that of burping, or if one trade was to be favoured, the other would have to be as also. However, by sending the select committee, the House would be put in possession of that information.

PARSONS replied, and said that since this debate had been commenced he had taken the trouble of looking through the list members of that House, and had found that there was not a single representative of the manufacturing interest in the House. It was all very well to talk of the House, but it was not so easy for them to get a satisfactory proof why it should be done; and he would

[illegible]

the result of personal spite towards one of their number. He
contend that the business of a shoemaker was quite as
valuable to the society as that of a carrier, and he
did not see why, if the Legislature persisted in this line, they
should not in the same measure deprive of power such

